



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Volume XIV

JANUARY, 1910

Number 1

## THE RELIGIOUS FUNCTION OF PUBLIC WORSHIP

---

PRESIDENT WILLIAM H. P. FAUNCE, D.D. LL.D.  
Brown University, Providence, R. I.

---

A wave of social consciousness is now sweeping over our land, and at the same time there is obviously a wave of recession from public worship. The tide of corporate endeavor is at the full, but the tide of corporate devotion mysteriously ebbs. Just when men are getting together as never before in congresses, conventions, federations, to consider every phase of educational and altruistic endeavor, just when women are meeting constantly in clubs and associations for study, for philanthropy, for civic betterment, precisely this is the time when both men and women show an increasing disinclination to assemble for the purpose of public worship. This disinclination exists not alone among the irreligious or immoral, it exists most obviously among the devout and the thoughtful—it exists among the readers of this *Journal*. Whatever the causes of this paradoxical situation, it is obvious that our ordinary public worship fails to meet the vital needs of the people. While the function of worship in the Middle Ages filled the people with an ecstasy of adoration, worship frequently seems to the modern man either a superfluity—"the touching of one's cap to the commanding general before the soldier goes into battle"—or a positive hindrance, the substitution of empty surviving forms in place of noble ethical passion and effective humanitarian endeavor. "The feeling," says Sir Oliver Lodge, "with which some go away from an average place of worship is too often a feeling of irritation and regret for wasted time." There is clearly

need of study of the psychology of worship. What is the object of worship, and what is necessary in order to attain that object?

The word "worship"—if we may drop for a moment into the often deceptive region of etymology—has passed through various meanings. Primarily of course it signified a state of worth. Next it came to mean an appreciation of worth, a sense of value, the state of emotion arising in one who beholds a worthwhile person. Then it came to mean the outward expression of such appreciation in words of esteem or honor. Then the word came to be set apart for religious uses, and to signify our appreciation of the worth or worthiness of God, our emotional out-go toward him in praise and prayer. Finally, as the hardening and specializing process has continued, the word has grown into a more technical meaning. Today it is applied to certain public acts performed by a religious assembly in consecrated buildings, acts having the order and sequence and symbolism of ritual, and designed to express our collective appreciation of the worthfulness of God.

A single passage in the Authorized Version shows us the word "worship" in this process of transition. The guest invited to a feast has sat down in the lowest place. Soon he is bidden to take a higher place: "then shall thou have worship in the presence of them that sit at meat with thee" (Luke 14:10). Evidently this means that the guest should win appreciation and esteem, and also should receive the outer marks of such esteem (R. V.: "glory") in words of commendation or gestures of approval on the part of the assembled company. We, then, publicly worship God when we vividly feel his greatness and goodness, and join with others in some collective expression of his majesty and moral value. The paradoxical situation of the church today is that never before was there so deep a sense of moral values as now, never so great desire for collective action, and yet never before so little inclination to join in expressing collective values in the ordered acts of public worship.

The psychology of the crowd has been widely studied in recent years, and Le Bon's classical work has been the basis of much investigation. The general laws observed in the behavior of crowds are the same whether the object of the crowd is political or social or religious. The physical contiguity of men is merely the first step in

the formation of a "crowd" or a "congregation." We bring bodies together in a building only that we may then fuse minds and hearts in a spiritual unity. We ring bells or publish notices or take other means of calling an assembly, merely in order that after physical proximity is secured, we may more easily gather up the many desires in one collective aspiration, and weld the multitude of wills into a collective and dominating will. A true congregation is vastly more than an aggregation. The assembling of a multitude is useless if the individual units are to remain in isolated consciousness—like the clocks in a jewelers' window, each ticking busily and noisily regardless of the rest. A true assembly is rather like the electric clocks installed in a modern office building, each dial regulated constantly by the central clock on the first floor. The great question about any assembly is: Do these various intelligences unite in one great insight? Do these many wills fuse in yielding to any superior will? Do these human souls, full of various jangling desires and wandering impulses, melt into any one great desire, and throb with one great purpose? We know how the Crusades swept men as by a whirlwind into a wholly new realm of sacrifice, and the cry, "God wills it," burst from 10,000 throats at once. We know how the religious revival has fused multitudes into a unitary consciousness where individual pain and sorrow were quite forgotten. But the same phenomenon in lesser measure appears in every service of worship, unless the service is a failure—as it frequently is. Merely to get men inside a church is useless. To seat them "by hundreds and by fifties" means nothing in itself. The question is not how many are present, but how many are united and fused in a true "crowd," with that escape from individual limitations, that immense receptivity, and that enormous power which a crowd may always develop.

The characteristics of a crowd are: first, the partial submergence of the single consciousness in some greater consciousness; next, the obvious contagion of ideas and emotions; and last, the peculiar susceptibility of the assembly to suggestion from without. All these phenomena may well be studied in the narrative of Pentecost, in the life of Francis of Assisi, and in the lives of Whitefield and Wesley and Finney. Such phenomena may be found in the experience of Beecher facing the mob at Liverpool and triumphing over mob-suspicion

and lawlessness. Yet they are found not only in dramatic and unusual incidents, but in the ordinary service of every church. The great essentials to a religious service are the lessening—we may better say heightening—of the single consciousness into a great collective consciousness, the swift running of feeling from man to man, and the susceptibility of the entire assembly to conceptions and impulses from the leader. Where these things exist, a true congregation comes into being, whether it number twenty or twenty thousand. The individual personalities are filled, transcended, and overborne, as all the little salt pools on the beach are filled and united by the rising tide.

By this submergence of private desire and will in the general consciousness a man may rise or he may descend in character. "The crowd may be better or worse than the individual."<sup>1</sup> It is not true that the phenomena of great assemblies are merely pathological. It is mere intellectual snobbishness for the monk in his cell or the philosopher in his retreat to look down on great assemblies as mere flocks of heedless sheep. To speak of the "recognized lowering of critical ability, of the power of accurate observation, indeed of rationality, which merely being one of a crowd induces,"<sup>2</sup> is to exaggerate, and to ignore certain compensating facts. Of course the crowd is not the place for scientific experiment. One would hardly choose the center of Brooklyn bridge for an astronomical observatory. But on the other hand, one would not choose an observatory as the place to study human nature. If the crowd may descend under the spell of the demagogue, it may also soar to incredible heights of aspiration and devotion under the speech of the prophet. If the crowd cried "Crucify him," the crowd also cried a little later: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" The man who imagines that it is the mark of superior intellect to build a cabin in the forest, as did Thoreau, and avoid all the massing of his fellows, is self-deceived and self-excluded from the most thrilling and energizing experiences of life. The man who has not quivered and glowed at the passing of the regiment, who has not shouted and sung with hundreds of others at some celebration by his school or college, who has not bowed with a great

<sup>1</sup>Le Bon, *The Psychology of the Crowd*, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup>Jastrow, *Fact and Fable in Psychology*, p. 133.

multitude confessing its sin, is still a partial and isolated person, of limited and provincial experience. Shall he from his fastidious "palace of art" look down disdainfully on the robust and red-blooded men who sing and pray together on a Sunday? Rather let him look *up* to them, as to those who are entering into social and racial experiences to which he is a stranger.

Deep in human nature lies, therefore, the necessity for congregational worship. In spite of the printing of the books of which there is no end, in spite of the ubiquitous and monstrous Sunday newspaper, in spite of the tragic failure of many churches to feed the souls of men, it still remains true that apart from physical assembly some of the noblest religious experience of the race has been and always will be impossible. Whoever has heard Wendell Phillips in Tremont Temple pleading for justice, or Phillips Brooks in Trinity Church pouring out a soul that shrank from all private confession, has realized that the isolated man is a fragment and that only in union do we achieve highest vision and victory.

Yet these great possibilities are rarely realized, because of certain faults in the form of worship, which render it nugatory to some men and injurious to the finer feelings of others. Of these, two faults are the most common today—crudity and fragmentariness.

The crudity of many forms of worship renders them useless to persons of genuine sensibility. When the Scripture is read as if it were a railroad time-table, or on the other hand as if it were a text-book in elocution, the result is the reverse of devotional. When prayer ostensibly addressed to God takes the form of an harangue to the audience, the effect is the same as that produced by any other form of hypocrisy. In many churches the performance of the choir is admirable from an aesthetic standpoint, but quite irrelevant as an aid to worship. Indeed in most churches the task of the preacher is rendered vastly more difficult by the intrusion of incongruous or impertinent music. After the choir by elaborate performance has brought the congregation into the concert-mood, the preacher is expected to remove that mood and replace it by the temper of devotion. In some churches the ordinance of baptism is a mere survival of what was at the banks of the Jordan deeply and tenderly significant, but is now repeated amid such irreverence and vulgar curiosity as to make

it hardly more than a kind of amateur dramatics. The Lord's Supper is in some places so shabbily administered as to repel the worshipful mind, and a carelessness which we should not for a moment allow in our homes is not infrequently seen at the table of the Lord. The invention of individual cups—in which the fear of microbes has proved stronger than love of the brethren—has converted the sacred Supper from a symbol of a common life and an all-embracing love into the extreme expression of a timid individualism and an unmistakable *noli me tangere*. When the common cup, which symbolizes undying unity, is split into scores of glass thimbles symbolizing hygienic protection from the contaminating touch of other men, is not the resulting ceremony an inversion of the original *communion*? Of course the Christian consciousness may in time adjust itself to this inversion, as to many other radical changes of symbol. But at present the most striking expression of modern religious separatism is in many churches to be seen at the Lord's Supper. In all worship due care should be exercised lest our most sacred ritual either become slovenly in method, or drift far away from its "inward and spiritual grace."

But the chief defect in worship is that it frequently expresses a fragment of our human nature, when in its ideal form it should gather up and express the total personality of the worshipers. That which impresses us in the worship of the Middle Ages is that it spoke for the whole man and spoke to the whole man. In the vast rituals of pagan Greece and Rome, poor as was much of the teaching, the entire nature of the worshiper was in play. A public sacrifice before the sailing of the fleet, or at the return of the conquering general, appealed to the whole nation and to the whole experience of every citizen. It was a proclamation of doctrine, an expression of gratitude and joy, an aesthetic triumph, a union of music and sculpture and all the arts in the service of religion, a union of all public and private institutions in symbolic action, and it spoke to the nation and for the nation with a comprehensiveness which has now become difficult or impossible. Our modern worship shows plainly its submission to the great command: "Come ye out from among them and be ye separate." It has gained moral purity by isolating itself from large sections of experience. Our problem is to preserve that purity and yet enable

worship to express the entire nature of man and the experience of the community.

Christianity appeals to the intellect, the emotions, and the will. It is at the same time a system of truth, a storehouse of feeling, and an ideal of conduct. To man's intellect it offers truths long hidden from the wise and prudent. To the emotional life it offers objects of deep devotion and lasting allegiance. To conscience and will it offers an ethical ideal imperative and alluring. And all three aspects of human nature—the mental, the emotional, the volitional—must find adequate utterance in worship.

The Puritan made the intellectual element in worship supreme. With fierce zeal he broke the statues in the cathedrals, and built for himself a chapel where no image of man or tree or flower could distract, no stained glass could delight his vision, no swinging censer or tinkling bell could minister to the flesh, and no lust of the eye seduce his steadfast soul. He exalted the sermon at the expense of all other parts of the worship, because clear ideas of truth were essential to the moral life and instruction was the great task of religion. Knowledge of the true God was the chief essential, and to communicate such knowledge was the highest form of worship.

We who are the heirs of the Puritan tradition may well be thankful for this virile, if incomplete, conception of religious worship. At least it was not sensuous idolatry. It was free from sentimentalism and filled with robust and sturdy self-reliance. It would not be "carried to the skies on flowery beds of ease," but would patiently, logically, think its way to God, to righteousness and peace.

But the defect of Puritan worship was that it recognized only one way of approach to the city of Mansoul. Its exaltation of human reason as the central principle in man led to an exaltation of doctrine as of supreme value in worship. New England Christianity is bewildered today because New England is half filled by a foreign population born of the Latin races, to whom the service of the Puritan meeting-house is quite unintelligible. To our Italian and French and Portuguese populations the worship of the average Protestant church, with its cool and logical process, makes little appeal, while deep in their hearts is an inborn longing for fervor and color and symbol and pageant. One trembles to think what would happen to



this great foreign population if the Roman Catholic church were suddenly to withdraw its ministry before Protestantism is ready to discard its narrow appeal to the intellect alone, and is prepared to address all the legitimate hungers and aspirations of humanity.

It is a curious fact that the Puritans went to the Old Testament for the commonwealth, their ideals of law and government, but refused to take any hint from it as to the organization of worship. They exalted Moses at the court of Pharaoh, and Elijah defying Ahab, as models of popular resistance to tyranny. They sought to reconstruct the state as a true theocracy. How could they fail to see that the Old Testament worship was aglow with gorgeous colors, heavy with form and formula, rich in symbolism, and clearly pictorial in its proclamation of every truth? The modern critic may indeed shake off every Old Testament suggestion or regulation, as a species of materialism belonging to the early stages of religious development. But the upholder of the verbal inspiration and Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch cannot disdain in modern worship the use of such rich symbolism as he holds was divinely ordained for ancient Israel. We cannot affirm that Israel's use of sound and color and golden censer and embroidered curtain reveals the mind of God regarding human approach, and at the same time affirm that the Puritan abhorrence of all symbolism is likewise in accord with divine direction. The so-called change of dispensations cannot mean a change in human nature. Either the worship of Israel was puerile, petty, materialistic, and tended only to hide Jehovah from the worshiper, or there is inherent in human nature a demand for religious symbolism and a deep necessity for the concrete and visible expression of religious faith.

The position of the Puritan and the Quaker is a "reform against nature." In the justifiable revolt against ceremony that had become magic, and formula that had become incantation, they treated men as disembodied spirits, or rather as pure mental processes, as mere calculating machines. For children, and for men in the childish stage, logical demonstration of truth is both useless and repellent. It is "truth embodied in a tale," or in a simple ceremony, that "enters in at lowly doors."

In our own time the Chautauqua movement would have been

quite impossible apart from the badges and seals and enrolments and graduations which the fertile American mind invented in order to give physical recognition to intellectual work. The Salvation Army is the visible embodiment of a metaphor. It flees from surplice and crucifix, only to invent its own vestments and carry its own banners. Probably the modern army and navy would be impossible apart from the epaulets and gold braid at which civilians smile. Our colleges and universities are steadily reverting to the academic pageantry of the Middle Ages, finding in the gowns and hoods shelter from the crudeness and extemporaneousness and personal eccentricity which bring all true dignity into contempt.

Of course it will be pointed out that our university decorations are free from the fatal assumption of divine authority which so inheres in ecclesiastical robes and insignia. This is happily true. No man dreams that because a man wears a doctor's gown and a gold tassel he therefore may assume to control the thought or action of his fellow-men. These academic regalia symbolize not authority, but attainment, fellowship, and joy of possession. The moment they become the accouterments of tyranny, that moment we must discard them. But has not the time come in religion when such symbols may be helpers of our joy? If a stained-glass window will help us to conceive the past or the unseen, why not have it? If a processional at the opening of service is more seemly than a choir straggling into church in distractingly various costumes, who shall forbid? The amount of such ceremonial we can wisely use depends on the amount of clear thought and spiritual energy that the church possesses. Liturgy as substitute for thought, and symbol as consolation for departed spiritual life, we cannot admit or endure. First there must be an inside, then an outside. First, the deep realization of God's power and nearness, then for that realization the appropriate and tangible expression. First, the allegiance of the soul to the living Lord, and then the expression of that allegiance in all ritual that is fair and significant and impressive.

There are three essential qualities in all worship—sincerity, a close relation of the ritual to the life which is to follow, and a vivid sense of the presence of the infinite.

Without sincerity, in creed, in symbol, in hymns, in public address,

worship, of course, becomes hollow and positively repellant to truth-loving men. All ritual is the expression of previous life, as the sea-shell is the deposit and envelope of some marine creature which once lived in it. But a museum of empty shells is not more useless than a collection of prayers and hymns and creedal statements which the Christian experience has outgrown. From generation to generation the best formulas of the church must be constantly revised or they will become falsehoods. The Presbyterian church was driven to propose a shorter and simpler creed than the Westminster Confession by the inner demand for an utterance of faith that should be true to present experience. The Church of England is now at work on a revision of that marriage service which has become shocking to modern ears. The imposition of certain liturgical forms upon a generation which has grown away from them is a cause of keenest distress among the clergymen of today. When the modern minister is compelled to say at baptism: "This child is now regenerate," must he not inwardly shrink from the original meaning of the phrase? When he quotes Isaac and Rebekah to the newly wedded pair, does he still regard those Old Testament characters as divinely chosen models? When the church officer standing at the head of the pew sings of himself as

A guilty, weak, and helpless worm,

or cries, in the words of another hymn,

At thy feet  
A guilty rebel lies,

is he true to himself and his own experience, or is he hiding behind another man's experience and masquerading in the place of prayer? The hymnology of the church sadly retards its advancing life, and men sing not so much what they feel as what they believe their fathers felt. The disciple of Darwin still labors on Sunday morning to take the world-view of Isaac Watts, and the college Senior after a course in modern ethics endeavors soberly to pronounce himself "vile" as "the dying thief."

These incongruities do not mean deliberate hypocrisy. They mean that the rapidly expanding experience of religion has found in many cases no genuine and worthy expression. It is a twentieth-

century spirit still compelled to wear an eighteenth- or sixteenth-century garb. The average hymnbook is at least fifty years behind the average church, and a hundred years behind the modern conscience. On a recent Sunday evening the writer labored for a half-hour to show the congregation that the old extreme idea of individual escape must now be supplemented by the idea of the salvation of society which Christ embodied in the "Kingdom of God." At the close of the sermon the choir rendered "Let some droppings fall on me"—entirely unconscious that they were melodiously opposing all the preacher had said. But our hymnbooks and choirs are still looking on the world through the eyes of St. Bernard and William Cowper.

Closely connected with sincerity is the maintenance of intimate relation between the worship of the church and the life of the world. Our generation is eager for results. It asks about church service, as about all else, *Cui bono?* Men of our time are not impatient of serious thought. They are not averse to brooding meditation. The inventor in our day ponders as long and patiently as did St. Francis or St. Dominic. The chemist retires from the world and enters into his closet as seriously as did any mediaeval anchorite. The astronomer understands the value of vigil and self-denial as truly as the monks of the Grande Chartreuse. But this modern withdrawal from the world, this concentration of the mind on fact or truth, is for some clearly defined objective end. The growing approximation of study and life is everywhere obvious. The vocational aim is transforming our universities and our high schools. An education that is a mere luxurious self-indulgence, the mere enjoyment of acquisition, with no thought of future service, is in our generation repudiated by every worthy school.

Then in the church the mere indulgence of emotion under the name of worship can no longer be justified. That emotion may be a delight in stained glass and gorgeous procession and perfumed air, or it may be the happiness of reconciliation with oneself and one's God. But if it does not lead outward into effective action for humanity, if it is not focused on the coming of the Kingdom, it is a spurious thing, a form of self-pity or self-laudation. True worship has in all ages been a preparation for action. So Moses prayed before he led the

host through the sea. So the Continental Congress prayed before it drew up the immortal Declaration. In that spirit was held the Haystack prayer-meeting at Williamstown. In that spirit the primitive church tarried in Jerusalem, preparing for the time when signs and wonders should be done in Corinth, Athens, and Rome.

The lamentable fact is that most of our church services lead nowhere. They conclude in themselves, like the eastern serpent biting its own tail. If the pews are well occupied, the collection large, the singing aesthetically pleasing, if the attention is held by the preacher, and if the congregation breaks up with a pleasurable glow of feeling, we seem to think that the goal of the service has already been reached. But this is to confuse putting on the uniform with fighting the battle. "Is the sermon done?" said a late-comer standing in the vestibule of the church. "No," was the reply, "it is ended, but it yet remains to be done."

The last time I saw Dwight L. Moody, he was full of concern over the aimlessness and ineffectiveness of Sunday-evening services in our great cities. "If I was a young man living in——," he said, "I would not go to church Sunday evenings. I have looked over the list of all the church announcements, and there is really nothing vital done on Sunday evening. The services are merely weak repetitions of the morning service, with no real object in view." If the men stay away from church today, their absence is not due to innate depravity or to hostility to the Christian faith. It is chiefly because church-going seems to the vast majority a pointless custom. Fifty years ago a man must attend church to learn the news of the day, to retain his place in society, to put himself in touch with social and political forces. These reasons are no longer valid, and the modern man asks himself, perhaps unconsciously: What is being actually done at the church? Are opinions being molded, principles and policies discussed, new enterprises started, new moral battles planned? Does the church sound a trumpet-summons, or does it merely administer, under the name of "Christian consolation," a moral anaesthetic? Robert Gould Shaw, bidding his bride farewell at the church door, while he mounted his horse and rode away to die at Fort Wagner, is inexhaustibly suggestive of the relation of church service to heroic endeavor.

And this in no way conflicts with the third characteristic of genuine worship—the sense of the Infinite as immediately present. Both the search for truth and allegiance to duty must be bathed and transfigured in a sense of the unexplored riches, the boundless strength, the overflowing peace, of a present God. There can be no possible substitute for genuine religion—the sense of direct access to the highest and holiest. Yet this is the rarest, as it is the most precious, of human attainments. No eloquence or knowledge in the preacher can make him a true prophet, unless he brings to his congregation this sense of being in the presence-chamber of God, and seeing every problem and task in its relation to the “pattern in the mount.”

Here is a constant defect in many ministers of really enlightened intelligence and liberal spirit. They seem to have no sense of wonder left. To their clear eyes the mystery and awe of human life have somehow evaporated, and what Phillips Brooks called “a tight little conception of God” has taken their place. To their rationalistic minds all mystery has been explored and charted; all the deeper enigmas of humanity are explained away. Christianity is reduced to its lowest terms, and all is as fatally clear as in Watts’ description of heaven:

No midnight shade, no clouded sun,  
But sacred high eternal noon.

Under the dominance of the rationalistic temper, the church becomes a lecture-room, the sermon an address on social or civic morality, and the service of worship a sort of educational convention. From such a service men depart intellectually improved, but with no imperative sense of the immanent God in their lives. In such a service men sit contiguous, but severely isolated, shunning all self-surrender, constantly on guard against the sudden or the mystical, and so avoiding the deeper experiences of the religious life.

On the other hand, churches that will not submit to this desiccation of faith may err by slipping into an attitude of familiarity, which also excludes genuine sense of God. In such churches the sanctuary is the auditorium, and the vestibule is the “lobby.” The people chat lightly before service and forget to pray after it. Such worship habitually ignores the tragedy and burden of the world, and seems to say: “Let not God speak with us, lest we die.”

But the true church must take the people seriously, steadily refuse mere entertainment, and lift the congregation into the full and radiant joy of the realization of God. The preacher who faces a congregation on Sunday morning must perceive his problem before he can solve it. On the one hand he has some rare advantages such as no other speaker can expect. He speaks on a day set apart for such speaking. The store and the mill and the office have been closed that the prophet may be heard. The congregation is never hostile, but is usually in sympathy with the preacher before the first word is spoken. The place is rich with associations, the time is one of expectation, the hush of the world's noises gives rare opportunity, while limitation of voluntary movement, due to stiff clothing and immovable pews, makes the assembly susceptible to any sort of suggestion. On the other hand the preacher is hindered by the monotony of ritual, by the deadening effect of long-continued worship in the same spot, and by the popular familiarity with his theme. He is hindered by the heterogeneousness of an assembly embracing the veteran and the stripling, the clerk and the millionaire, the college professor and the bricklayer. Can he speak so vitally and sincerely as to pierce through decorous apathy and touch the springs of life? Can he address the universal need in a universal language? Can he melt those various and opposing interests into one supreme concern, unite all those petty wills in one eternal will, and banish fear and care and pain in the sense of the immediate divine plenitude?

He certainly cannot do this by a fragmentary and provincial service—by mere formulation of ideas, or mere sensuous appeal, or mere ethical discussion. He has a right to summon to his service all that makes appeal to the entire nature of man. It is impossible that any one form of worship should be equally effective for all men. The varieties of denominational expression are due to temperamental differences rather than to victories in debate. But the time has now come when each church may learn from all others, and when we may see beneath the theological and liturgical variations the common psychological need. To one temperament prayer is most real when the worshiper is kneeling, gazing at a picture of Christ; to another when all symbols are banished and the heart cries out in need; to another *laborare est orare* and the “cup of cold water” is a communion

chalice. But the aim of all these modes of approach is to attain to the experience of a present God. The church should rejoice in the many gates through which men enter the celestial city. It should encourage architecture, painting, and sculpture as servants of the religious feeling. It should utilize universal literature, supplementing Thomas à Kempis and Baxter with Carlyle and Browning. It should welcome scientific research as simply the fulfilment of the demand of religion: "Handle me and see that it is I myself." It should avail itself of all significant symbols, as often succeeding where other language fails. The church that is to render service to all humanity must regard the realization and experience of an immanent God as its supreme gift, and steadily use all art, literature, science, and symbolism, to make that experience credible and alluring.